

REMARKS

Claims 5, 8, 11-13, 17-20, 27-32, 34-40, 43 and 44 are remaining in this patent application. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14-16, 21-26, 33, 41 and 42 are canceled, and Claims 5, 8, 27-30, 34-38, 40, 43 and 44 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and review of the application in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

At the outset, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 5, 8, 27, 29-32 and 36-42, and the allowance of Claims 11-13 and 17-20. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the allowable claims to independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have also amended Claims 28, 34, 35, 43 and 44 to depend on an allowed claim. As further discussed below, all claims remaining in this application are deemed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to show a "telescoping section" of the frame as recited in Claims 41 and 42. In the interest of advancing this application to allowance, Applicants have canceled these claims. This ground of objection is thereby deemed moot.

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 16, 21-24 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Smith et al. The Examiner also rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Swift. The Examiner also rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Berridge. The Examiner also rejected Claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith et al. The Examiner also rejected Claims 25, 28 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Swift. The Examiner also rejected Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Bishop et al. The Examiner also rejected Claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Swift. The Examiner also rejected Claims 2, 3, 7, 14 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hughes in view of Bishop et al. For the reasons set forth in the prior Amendment, Applicants consider these rejections improper and the claims allowable. Nevertheless, in the

Serial No. 10/759,500
May 27, 2008
Page 15

interest of advancing the application to allowance, Applicants have opted to cancel these claims (with the exception of Claims 28, 34, 35, 43 and 44) without prejudice to the filing of a continuation application. Accordingly, these rejections are all moot and should now be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5, 8, 11-13, 17-20, 27-32, 34-40, 43 and 44 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

While Applicants believe that no fee is due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

Date: May 27, 2008

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 So. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000